

REMARKS

Claims 1-39 are pending in this application.

The Examiner's objection to the drawings is based on his rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 directed to the limitation "at least one coupler" (infra). As this language has been canceled from the claims, the objection to the drawings no longer is pertinent.

The Examiner's rejection of claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph has been avoided by amendment of the claim to provide antecedent basis for "the transmitter."

The rejection of claims 1-39 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph has been avoided by canceling the language "at least one" with respect to coupler. As noted above, this also renders the objection to the drawings moot.

Claims 1-8, 17-18 and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Albert (6118426) in view of Weinberger (7028304).

It is noted that this is a final rejection and that Weinberger is a newly cited reference.

The Albert invention is directed to transducers and indicators having printed displays which is described by the inventor as creating an electronically addressable display which includes multiple printing operations similar to a multicolor process in conventional screen printing. The end product and the method of achieving it are very different than the applicants' placard for displaying a customer's specific message which includes a receiver, a capacitor, and an electronic updateable static display.

The coupling features as now claimed are not present in Albert as amended. The claims now provide for a coupler connected to a member selected from the group

consisting of an in-flight entertainment system, an airline reservation system and an airline boarding system for receiving a second customer specific message therefrom. The independent claims as amended all require the coupler and it is to be coupled as described in the specific claim. The inclusion of the coupler provision, i.e., in connection with the receiver and retrieving a customer specific message therethrough from the various systems results in the failure of Albert for purpose cited.

The Examiner acknowledges that Albert alone did not anticipate (previous office action) or in connection with an obviousness rejection as “Albert does not disclose at least one coupler connected to one member of the recited group for receiving a second customer specific message therefrom and relies on Weinberger to cure the omission noting that “Weinberger discloses an airline passenger system (Fig. 1 for example) comprising: at least one coupler (235 in fig. 7 for example) connected to at least one member selected from the group comprising an in-flight entertainment system (268 in fig. 5; or example) for receiving a second customer specific message therefrom (clear from figs. 1-7); wherein a display is connected to said at least one coupler (122 in fig. 7 for example).”

Weinberger is specific to a system server used to manage communication over a network between the system server and a plurality of physical devices of a passenger entertainment system. The system is configured and operated using software to provide passenger entertainment. The system server comprises software for instantiating a dispatch object to open a framework network addressable unit objects, for instantiating one or more virtual line replaceable unit objects to manage communication between a network address unit and physical devices, and for communicating network messages

through the dispatch object to the physical devices. The dispatch object tracks messages to the physical devices utilizing a queue and tracks messages from the physical devices utilizing a queue and maintains the status of one or more of the virtual line replaceable units. The network addressable unit objects move data from one storage location to another. (Abstract).

The Examiner has anticipated that this reference cannot be used properly in connection with Albert as Weinberger is not analogous art. It is the Examiner's position that Albert and Weinberger are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor, namely air travel related display systems.

The Albert invention is related to printed displays and is classified in U.S. Class 345/107 etc. (see page 1 of the patent). Weinberger is directed to virtual line displaceable units for a passenger entertainment system classified in U.S. class 719/110 (see page 1 of patent).

The mere fact that an entertainment system is the main subject matter of Weinberger does not render it analogous art to Albert where an entertainment system is an option to be plugged into a very different system. The skilled in the art would not consider Weinberger to be within the field of the invention in issue nor would he consider it to be reasonably pertinent to the technological problem being worked on that he would turn to it to seek a solution to his problem. Weinberger is a reference from a nonanalogous art.

This ground of rejection should be withdrawn.

The rejection of the dependent claims similarly should be withdrawn.

The request for withdrawal of rejection of dependent claims also applies to the dependent claim 9 which was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Albert in view of Weinberger and further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art, and dependent claims 10-14 and 39 which are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albert in view of Weinberger and further in view of Gelbman (6753830).

The Examiner has rejected claims 15-16, 24-26, 28-31 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Albert and Weinberger in further view of Ehrenberger (5785283). Ehrenberger is relied on as disclosing "wherein a receiver comprises a transponder (note transducer 148 in fig. 2)."

For all of the reasons set forth above, Albert and Weinberger fail as a combination to suggest the applicants' invention and Ehrenberger does not cure this deficiency. Therefore, the rejection on this ground should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 19 and 36-37 over Albert in view of Weinberger in further view of Isomichi (6633225).

The Examiner recites that he has concluded that at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include transceiver circuitry for half duplex communication, as taught by Ehrenberger, in the system of Albert and Weinberger.

Claims 19, 36-37 are dependent claims. The independent claims from which they depend do not contain all of the limitations of the instant invention. Isomichi does not either but is relied on as set forth above.

Isomichi is directed to a paging system. With respect to claim 19, the Examiner relied on Albert to teach all of the limitations of the parent claim (claim 18) and further relied on Isomichi to teach an airline paging system comprising a plurality of wireless addressed a/v units, each of which displays a passenger's name, flight number and seat number.

Claim 18 depends from claim 17. As presented above, Albert fails to teach all of the limitations of claim 17, thus failing to teach all of the limitations of claim 18. In Isomichi, the boarding information, along with the identification codes, is transmitted from the paging base station (which is interpreted as the equivalent of the transmitter in the application) to the pagers (which is considered as the equivalent of the placards). In the present application, the identification codes and a first customer specific message are transmitted by the transmitter to the placards, and a second customer specific message including boarding information is not retrieved from the transmitter but through a coupler which is a part of a placard and connected to the boarding, reservation and in-flight entertainment systems. A comparison shows that Isomichi fails to teach the "at least one coupler connected to at least one member selected from the group comprising an in-flight entertainment system, an airline reservation system, and an airline boarding system for receiving a second customer specific message therefrom," wherein the at least one coupler is a part of the placard. Albert and Isomichi when considered as a whole would not teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claim 19 and the rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

Claims 36 and 37 depend from claim 32. With respect to claim 36, the Examiner relied on Albert to teach all of the limitations of claim 32 and relied on Isomichi to teach

a signal having a customer specific message associated with a reserved seat for a specified customer. With respect to claim 37, the Examiner relied on Albert to teach all of the limitations of claim 32 and further relied on Isomichi to teach retrieving the customer specific message from an airline reservation or boarding system. Based on similar arguments presented with respect to claim 19, Albert fails to teach all of the limitations of the base claim (claim 32), in particular for the lack of teaching of the coupler coupled to the placard and the use thereof for receiving a second customer specific message from the various systems and Isomichi fails to cure the deficiency. The rejections of claim 36 and 37 should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 20-23 (35 U.S.C. 103(a)) over Albert in view of Ehrenberger in further view of Matsuzaki. The Examiner admits that neither Albert or Ehrenberger expressly disclose associating the placards with seats. Matsuzaki being relied on to provide this omitted limitation of the noted claims. The latter reference is directed to a passenger vehicle polling system.

The applicants' earlier arguments with respect to nonanalogous art are incorporated herein as if set forth in their entirety.

The rejection of claims 20-23 should be withdrawn due to the improper combination of references.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albert in view of Weinberger and Ehrenberger and further in view of Isomichi.

The rejected claim is a dependent claim. The Examiner relied on Albert and Ehrenberger to teach all of the limitations of claim 26 and further relied on Isomichi to teach a customer specific message comprising a seat identification and a user selected

name. As presented previously with respect to claim 26, Albert and Ehrenberger fail to teach all of the limitations of claim 26, particularly the lack of teaching of the coupler. Based on similar arguments presented previously with respect to claim 19, Isomichi's paging system also fails to overcome this deficiency (the lack of the teaching of the at least one coupler). Therefore, Albert, Ehrenberger and Isomichi when considered as a whole would not teach or suggest the claimed invention. The rejection of claim 27 should be withdrawn.

The combination of Albert, Weinberger and the other cited references no matter how interpreted do not teach the invention as defined by applicants' independent claims supplemented by the additional references.

This is also true for the addition of Briechle as expressed in paragraph 16, page 25 of the office action with respect to the rejection of claims 34-35 and 38– Briechle has been relied on as teaching waiting for a specified period (dwell time; fig. 12) by using a timer (69 in fig. 6; LCD driver is supplied the data registers, and as such decodes the time between display updating; col. 8, lines 38-43) coupled to a message memory (70 in fig. 6) that is started upon the action of displaying the customer specific message on the electronic updateable static display (clear from fig. 16).

In addition to being non-analogous art, the reference does not teach or suggest the limitations of the independent claim in issue.

The Examiner relied on Albert to teach all of the limitations except for waiting for a specified period by using a timer coupled to a memory that is started upon the action of displaying the customer specific message on the display, and further relied on Briechle to cure the deficiency. As presented above with respect to claim 32, Albert fails to teach all

of the limitations of claim 32 which is the parent of claims 34-35. Briechle would not be able to cure this deficiency, i.e., retrieving a second customer specific message associated with each of the placard identifications.

It is submitted that the Examiner has amassed a large number of references and applied them as he saw fit to support a claim of obviousness. For all of the reasons set forth above and most important, the failure of any of them or any proper combination thereof to teach the applicants' invention supports the patentability thereof.

Withdrawal of the final rejection and allowance of the claims as now amended is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted
Respectfully Submitted,
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: July 19, 2007

/evelyn m. sommer/
Joshua S. Broitman
Registration No. 38,006
Evelyn M. Sommer
Registration No. 19, 603
OSTRAGER CHONG FLAHERTY AND
BROITMAN, PC
570 Lexington Avenue, 17th Floor
New York, NY 10022-6894
Phone: (212) 681-0600
Customer Number: 64722